REMARKS

With regards to the drawings applicant has submitted a replacement FIG. 5. With regards to FIG. 4, the specification has already been amended previously to cite the bin as bin (50). Therefore, the objections to the drawings should be removed.

The Examiner has continued his rejection of the claims as being obvious over Okuniewicz in view of Quinn and further in view of Castellano. The Examiner specifically states that the applicant did not submit any arguments. This is totally incorrect and egregious.

The following are the arguments taken from the previous Response dated March 5, 2008, none of which are addressed by the Examiner.

The Examiner states that visually displaying the number of coins needed to generate a ticket, and resetting counter coins to zero once a ticket is generated is a common function to any modern vending machines. However, there has never been a gaming machine which contains a processor for implementing a game of chance which shows a player the number of coins needed to generate a ticket, number of coins inserted by the player, or resets the coin count to zero once a ticket is generated. Although this may be a common feature for someone buying a candy bar, this is not a common feature for a gaming machine.

Quinn is a lottery ticket dispenser, i.e., a vending machine, and not a gaming machine. No one would think of putting the technology used in a gaming machine combining that with a vending machine.

Further, although the Examiner states that it would be obvious to modify Okunewicz in view of Quinn. Okunewicz specifically states that it does not want the player to know how many coins are needed to generate a ticket, but wants the ticket to be generated randomly. Therefore, adding the feature of counting the coins played and visually showing the user the number of coins needed to generate a ticket go against the teachings of Okunewicz.

Again, since Okuniewicz states that the dispensing of tickets is done randomly without showing the user the number of coins needed to generate a ticket, it would go against the normal operation of Okuniewicz to show the user when a ticket is going to be generated since Okuniewicz teaches that this is random. Further, these features are not added for convenience but they are added as taught in the patent so that a user continues to play the machine to win their ticket.

Quinn teaches paying for a ticket at a vending machine. The coins entered must add up to a specified dollar amount before a ticket is dispensed. If the dollar value of the coins entered does not add up to the amount on the counter, the purchaser would be confused.

The present invention teaches a slot machine where a player watches a counter to get a promotional bonus ticket. The coins entered do not have to add

up to a specific dollar amount for the slot player to understand when he will get a bonus ticket. For example; 9 quarters must add to $2.25 on the counter for Quinn, but for the present invention 9 quarters could add up to 9 on the counter and the player will understand. In fact, the present invention doesn't teach coin counting per se, rather it teaches the player to count slot machine plays or "pulses" as they are called in the industry. Every time a slot player pulls the handle on a slot machine, a pulse is recorded that tells the slot machine to spin the reels. Slot machines can take in 1 quarter and not register a pulse. The slot machine industry has a term called "Max Coin" that most, if not all regular slot players understand. What "Max Coin" means is that a player might have to play 3 coins at a time to be eligible for the bonus. Using the "Max Coin" the present invention's counter would only go up in increments of 1 each time "Max Coin" is played because only 1 "pulse" of the slot machine is recorded even though 3 coins are placed in the machine. Therefore, if 9 coins are played in a machine and the player plays 3 times, the present invention's counter goes to 3. But if the slot player plays the 9 coins 1 at a time, recording 9 slot machine plays or "pulses", the present invention's counter will read 0 because the player did not play the "Max Coin" amount necessary to receive a bonus. Neither Okuniewicz or Quinn alone or in combination teach this.

During an interview with the Examiner, the Examiner suggested the amendments shown in Claim 19. Also for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Claim 19 is not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner and has never argued that Okunewicz teaches dispensing a ticket when a preset amount of coin is inserted into the game. What applicant means by being random is that the player does not know what this number is and therefore the player randomly puts coins in and at a certain number of coins a ticket is dispensed. In the present invention, the player knows by the coin counter how many coins have been inserted into the game and how many more coins are necessary to put into the game in order to have a ticket dispensed. Therefore the prior art does not teach in combination what is taught by the claims of the present invention.

I hope that the Examiner considers the above arguments which were submitted in response to the last Office Action.

Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251
Garden City, NY 11530
(516) 739-1500

5